GOVERNMENT

OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

SPECIAL PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

MONDAY

JUNE 20, 2005

The Special public Meeting of the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened at 6:16 p.m. in the Office of Zoning Hearing Room at 441 4th Street, Northwest, Washington, D.C., Carol J. Mitten, Chairperson, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

CAROL J. MITTEN Chairperson
ANTHONY J. HOOD Vice-Chairman
GREGORY JEFFRIES Commissioner
JOHN G. PARSONS Commissioner

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON SCHELLIN Office of Zoning

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

STEPHEN MORDFIN Office of Planning

D.C. ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE:

ALAN BERGSTEIN, ESQ.

JACOB RITTING, ESQ.

- 1 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
- 2 6:16 p.m.
- 3 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen.
- We're starting this evening with a
 Special Public Meeting of the Zoning Commission of
 the 7District of Columbia for Monday, June 20th,
 2005. My name is Carol Mitten and joining me this
 evening are Vice Chairman Anthony Hood and
 Commissioners John Parsons and Greg Jeffries.
- We have a brief agenda for the Special Public Meeting and that's in the wall bin near the dods. And, Mrs. Schellin, do we have any preliminary matters before we begin?
- 15 MRS. SCHELLIN: Just one with the reflerence to the first case on the agenda. We have redeived a report from the NCPC saying that we're not8adversely affecting Federal interests.
 - 19 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Thank you.
- So, inasmuch as I didn't sit on the first two cases, Mr. Hood will take over and handle those matters.

- 1 Thank you.
- VICE CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Good 2 evening, colleagues.
- We have in front of us Zoning Commission Case No. 04-25. That's the Capital University Map Amendment. We've already had proposed action.
- Mrs. Schellin, do you have anything to add8
 - 9 MRS. SCHELLIN: No. Just the NCPC Report.
- VICE CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. I will move 10 approval of 04-25. That is the Map Amendment going from unzoned, identified as parcel number 121/29 of Square 3663 from unzoned to the R-5-A Zone District. And4I will ask for a second.
 - COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Second. 15
 - VICE CHAIRMAN HOOD: Moved and properly 16

seconded. Any discussion?

- All those in favor? 18
- 19 (AYES)
- VICE CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any oppositions? 20 So awanded.
- Staff, would you record the vote and do 22 we 2have a proxy from Mr. Hildebrand?
 - MRS. SCHELLIN: I do not have a proxy. 24
 - 25 Staff would record the vote three to zero

to two to approve final action in Case No. 04-25, the 2Map Amendment. Commissioner Hood moving, Commissioner Jeffries seconding, Commissioner Parsons in favor. Commissioner Mitten not voting, not5having participated and Commissioner Hildebrand not6voting, not being present.

- VICE CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you.
- Next on the agenda is Zoning Commission Case No. 04-25. I believe this is 25A. It's Catholic University - Further Processing.
 - Mrs. Schellin. 11
 - MRS. SCHELLIN: Nothing further. 12
 - VICE CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Thank you. 13
- You know, first when we had looked at 14 this, we asked that some more opposition testimony be 16 laced in the order. I think that's been done.
- Also, I think Commissioner Jeffries 17 wanted to know about the pavilion. The Office of Planning, I think you asked them to work it out between the Office of Planning. They came back to thelApplicant suggesting limiting the hours of operation between 10:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m.
- Are you comfortable with that? Okay. 23 And4that's all, I think that was debatable. There were some concerns.

- 1 So, with that, I will move approval of Zoning Commission Case No. 04-25A, Catholic University - Further Processing.
 - COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Second.
- VICE CHAIRMAN HOOD: It's been moved and seconded.
- Let me just also add to the motion and hoping, Commissioner Jeffries you would accept it, that we allow the U.S. Attorney's Office to have flexibility -- editorial changes?
- Mr. Parsons, no problem. I just want to add2that normally on the backside.
 - Mrs. Schellin? 13
- MRS. SCHELLIN: I just wanted to say one thing just to clarify.
- 16 The Case No. is still Case 04-25. It's just that the order number will be, because this is the 8 second portion of that same case. The order number will be 04-25A, but it is still the same case.
 - VICE CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. Okay.
- I was trying to differentiate the two. 22 But23anyway, thank you for making that clarification.
- The order number will be 04-25A. Zoning Commission Case is 04-25.

- Okay. It's been moved and seconded with also added for the friendly amendment.
 - 3 All those in favor?
 - 4 (AYES)
- 5 VICE CHAIRMAN HOOD: Any opposition? So ordered.
 - 7 Staff, would you record the vote.
- MRS. SCHELLIN: Staff would record the vote, three to zero to two to approve the further processing portion of Case No. 04-25. Commissioner Hood moving, Commissioner Jeffries seconding, Commissioner Parsons in favor, Commissioner Mitten not3having participated, not voting, Commissioner Hildebrand not present, not voting.
- 15 VICE CHAIRMAN HOOD: Thank you. Now, I turns it back over to the Chair.
 - 17 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. Hood.
- The last case for our Special Public Meating is Case No. 05-13, which is the Sua Sponte Reviow of the JBG/Louisiana LLC Project.
- And we had taken the submission as we are required to do from the Applicant in opposition to our 3review and they also made a motion to disqualify Commissioner Hildebrand and Commissioner Hildebrand recused himself, so we're down to the substance of

the 1 Sua Sponte.

- And where we had left off the last time we discussed this was that I was in the process of moving that we remand the case to the BZA, and I'll expand on the reasoning for that in a minute. And, I intend to reintroduce that motion tonight.
- I think that the issues that we discussed when we convened the last time on the subject remain. I don't think the Applicant in their opposition dealt with these things in any kind of substantive way. And so I would move that we remand the2case to the BZA and with the following dinaction.
- They had a conclusion in their order. I'll have to restate this because I'm now going to ramble a little bit. This is not going to be a clear motion.
- On page 9 of the order in Application No. 17291, the Board concludes that the extraordinary or exceptional situation or condition of the property regults in practical difficulties for the Applicant. The2unique conditions of the property render full compliance with the zoning regulations unduly burdensome and economically infeasible.
 - 25 There is nothing in the record on which

the 1BZA can base the conclusion of economic infeasibility other than an assertion by the AppBicant, which I think is a dangerous position for the 4BZA to take. And so one of the issues on remand would be to instruct the BZA to the extent they intend to rely on economic infeasibility as a reason for 7granting the variance, that they actually establish that with evidence in the record.

- The second issue would be that there seems to be imbedded in this case the notion that anylimpediment created by either historic issues or other zoning conditions that impair you from being able to use the full density that's permitted as a matter of right, that there should be a relief valve automatically and I don't believe that's true. So, I would want them to establish, if that is in fact their position, where in the zoning ordnance that that is suggested or supported.
- And then, thirdly, there was the issue about the standstill agreement and that being used as 2a basis for granting the variance and I'd like them to explore that as well.
- So, three issues on remand would be:

 Evidence in the record to the extent they intend to

 rely on economic infeasibility; the notion that

Applicants are entitled through a variance process to get full benefit of matter of right density, and; them the reliance on the standstill agreement.

- 4 And I'd ask for a second.
- 5 Okay. Then the motion fails for lack of a second. And I'd ask someone else to make a motion.
- 8 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Madam Chairman, this matter was brought to us on the matter of security by the Architect of the Capitol and others. To Ime, that is the mission before us, that is to review that aspect of the case.
- And I'm reminded of a situation that existed at Metropolitan Square overlooking the White House in the mid-'80s where the building was approved, not by this Commission. We didn't have any7right to. It was a matter of right building. Where the Secret Service was surprised and opposed to 18he fact as similar circumstances that existed to theone we have here. And that was worked out with theose are perimeter barriers, visual -- that is, I shouldn't use the word "plexiglass" but some kind of device is used to preclude anybody from firing a weapon into the area of the White House. There is

also some kind of controls over the access to the roof. And it seems to me that that is what we should be asking.

- The order ignores the concerns of the Architect of the Capitol, and what I would propose is that we remand this to the Board of Zoning Adjustment to take under advisement specific recommendations or conditions in the order that would deal with the security issues, such as perimeter barriers around the appropriate sides of the 1 building and a program of limited access to the rodi.
- So, that's maybe even less articulate than your motion. But that's where I would come from on this.
- 16 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. We have a motizon. Is there a second?
- VICE CHAIRMAN HOOD: If that's a motion, I 18 wanted to comment on it, but I don't want to necessarily second it.
- CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, I quess that would be productive, if Mr. Parsons can't get a second.
- COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Three strikes and 24 we 25e out.

- 1 VICE CHAIRMAN HOOD: I will say --
- 2 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You can second it just for purposes of discussion.
- 4 VICE CHAIRMAN HOOD: No. Because I might get5stuck. I don't want to get stuck.
- 6 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Go ahead, if you'nd like to kind of --
- 8 VICE CHAIRMAN HOOD: Even though I know it's on the table.
 - 10 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes.
- VICE CHAIRMAN HOOD: While I agreed in part with my colleague Mr. Parsons about the security issue, my concern as I stated previously is there was an entity that came in after the case, the waysI see it, and I guess their recommendations or there thoughts on how things should be handled was not 7 entered into the record.
- My only concern is, there are other entities that may not be on the same level as far as Secret Service or whatever, but I'm thinking in terms of community groups.
- When they come down and they have something that needs to get into the record and the BZA4has closed the case and they've made their dection, and then we open it back up. If we're

doing it for the Secret Service, I think we can do it for the ANCs and the civil associations and the city. And I just want to make sure that even though I may not be here, but I want to make sure that this Commission understands if we can do it for the Secret Service, we can do it for the ANC whatever in the 7District of Columbia or whoever, civic ass@ciation, those groups that may not be on that level as far as Secret Service in protecting a major entility in the Federal Government. So, I just want to Make sure that we have an understanding, and I would proceed.

- But on the second thought, a second item I wanted to bring up is if we're going to remand that, I don't agree with everything the Chair had, but 6we can ask them to look at it all. That's kind of 1where I am.
- I know that was a lot. That's a happy 18 medium.
- CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. We're working 20 towards something, so Mr. Jeffries, why don't you just jump in here.
- 23 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: I am very sympathetic to Madam Chair's concerns about economic inf@asibility and sort of the lack of any kind of

response, particularly in the follow-up I was really hoping that there would be some mention, paragraph or two, at least somehow addressed this whole issue of *conomic infeasibility. So, I was very much disappointed with that, because I think that would have given me a lot more comfort to move forward.

- I'm probably still at the place of perhaps not even doing anything, but I'm probably closer to Commissioner Parsons in this regard.
- The concern I have about the economic infieasibility piece is that I just don't know the kinds of information that we can receive that would give us comfort. I certainly don't want developers to 1start putting performance in front of us and us chacking returns and so forth and so on. I think that's a slippery slope. But I do wish that the Applicant had somehow addressed some of your concerns in the statement.
- So, I am probably leaning towards moving 19 along with Commissioner Parsons and taking a look at perhaps, you know, modifying the order to address some of the security concerns. So, I would probably second his motion.
- CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I need you to 24 definitely second his motion.

- 1 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: I will second Commaissioner Parsons' motion.
- CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. I want to comment on something and then ask Commissioner Parsons a question.
- You know, I understand your concern about the7slippery slope of asking applicants to submit pro8formas, but I think it's a slippier slope for the 9BZA to rely on assertions by applicants that are unproven, especially when it comes to economics. Sollthat's why I continue to have that concern.
- And my question for Commissioner Parsons 12 is 13I'm going to lead up to a question. I understand how4it happened that we were presented with this case to consider for sua sponte review. But at the time when we voted on it, I don't know if I made the motion or Commissioner Hildebrand made the motion, but18it was not on the narrow basis of the security issues. It was broader than that because I frankly didOnot find the issues related to security compelling but I at that time, called out these other issues. And you can ignore the rest of what I int28 oduced in my motion, but I feel really, really strengly about them relying simply on an assertion about economic feasibility, that there is nothing,

nothing in the record to establish that.

- 2 So, I would ask you to accept as a friendly amendment to your motion that if we're going to remand it, that we ask them to look at that morē narrow issue than the broader issue that I had suggested in my motion.
- COMMISSIONER PARSONS: You're offering a friendly amendment, I guess?
- 9 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I mean, I'm trying to10
- COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I mean, how would 11 you2articulate that?
 - CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That to the --13
- COMMISSIONER PARSONS: In other words, we dida't agree with the way you did it previously.
- 16 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Right. And I said three things and now I'm just saying one. I'm just saying the first issue, which is to the extent that the 9BZA has relied on economic infeasibility as a basis for granting the variance, that they reopen theirecord to take testimony and evidence to establish that and not merely rely on an assertion by 28he applicant.
- MR. BERGSTEIN: Well, can I just make one suggestion, Madam Chair?

- I think it should be presented to them, the 2BZA, as a two-step question. First, to identify what there is in the record. Actually, you're finding that there is nothing. But to at least give the 5Board an opportunity to indicate what it is specifically in the record that they believe ties the 7assertion of uniqueness with economic infeasibility. And then if there is nothing in the record to permit them to reopen the record, to take an *10 additional evidence that would be necessary to create that connection.
- 12 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. If that makes it lanymore acceptable to Mr. Parsons.
- 14 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Now, I see on page 8 and 9 of the Order, without the variance, this additional 50,000 square feet would be lost at an 18 conomic loss of approximately \$7.5 million. And I understand that that only gives one side of the penny.
 - 20 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Right.
- 21 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: It doesn't let you2set up the delta.
- And there's also on page 8 a discussion about the proposed garage would require 450 square feet for parking space. This will result in a

premium construction cost of \$2.5 million. It talks about a premium.

- I mean, you know, I would argue that there has been some level of discussion around economics, but you know, again I'm sympathetic to your issue around that they could have sort of stepped up and provided a lot more support around this. But, I don't know what we expect to receive from them, short of an outright pro forma and everything else. And I'm just not interested in going down that road and making that kind of request.
- And if someone else here can think of something else that we can get that can give you comfort, Madam Chair, that would be great.
- 16 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, I think that was7what Mr. Bergstein's suggestion was driving at.

 I mean, I don't find that just saying that something costs more or saying that I don't get to maximize my dersity and that was worth, you know, "X" million doblars, that doesn't establish feasibility or infeasibility. Those are just numbers that impact the3development.
- So, what Mr. Bergstein had suggested is that we ask the BZA to either articulate what it is

they relied on and maybe they'll just cite those numbers, and if it was me I still wouldn't be satisfied, or they would reopen the record and have a true sense of how one calculates feasibility.

- I guess what I am, I guess, unwilling to accept is that it's beyond them. Because if they're going to rely on this kind of argument, just like, you8know, there's traffic experts and we're not traffic experts, but we get advised by traffic experts. This is another area of expertise and if people need to have it broken down into a form that they can understand it, then they should ask for it. But3you don't just go well, you know, it makes my head hurt so I'm not going to ask for anymore information.
- COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: You know, what I was7hoping to receive from the Applicant is some discussion around, you know, the floor plates and that these floor plates might be such that they would end up fetching discounted rent. And when you consider the increased cost of development, you know, it makes it sort of a less attractive development rather than getting into discussions around actual numbers. But just giving us some balbpark projections as to, you know, how they are

somehow impacted without really getting into putting forth pro formas. I mean, I could probably get somewhat comfortable there. But, you know, I'm fine with the suggestion. I just would like to just make certain that this process does not drag on forever with a long list of requirements from the Applicant.

- 7 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Let's go to Mr.8Parsons.
- 9 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: So, the order is solfar identified \$4% million dollars worth of additional cost?
 - 12 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes.
- 13 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: And the 50,000 square feet without it would result in a loss of 7½ million. So, are you looking for the \$3 million?

 Is 16hat what this is about?
 - 17 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: No. No.
- 18 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: What are you looking for?
- 20 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. The loss of \$7½1million is merely against some theoretical devælopment that could occur, sort of absent a historic project. And also given there's a whole sezies of choices that the Applicant has made about designing their building that don't allow them to

maximize the density without the height relief.

Okay? So, the \$7% million means nothing to me
basically in terms of economic feasibility.

- The \$2½ million premium construction cost for5the garage and then the sheeting and shoring of \$2 million, that's \$4½ million of additional construction costs, some of which is self-imposed because the Applicant is over parking the project. But9you would have to say that \$4½ million of additional costs means that this building overall would cost more to construct than it would be worth where you're done. That's the test for feasibility is 15hat no one would do it because it wouldn't be worth what you had spent to put it there when you're done. And there's nothing in the record establishing that. It's just that there are some costs that are more expensive for this site, some of which are self-imposed. That's all we have.
- 19 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Well, now you've stranged into an area of self-imposed parking. So, you'lknow --
 - 22 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That's true.
- 23 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: -- where are you goized with this?
 - 25 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well --

- 1 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: You know, are you going to be satisfied when they come back and say, here is the cost. You'll say, well, the costs arem't real because you don't need all this parking. Are 5 you going to continue?
- CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: No. Just in you and I talking here, I've made it pretty narrow. I would be thrilled if they would take on the totality of what I see wrong with this case. But I'm trying to salwage something here.
- COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Yes. But, Madam 11 Chair, I think what Commissioner Parsons' point is is 18hat once you open up Pandora's box and you start to 14- I mean, this could go on and on. I mean, they've put information in front of you, then you canago, well, I don't know if that's really, you know, the cost per square foot of structured parking. I mean, you know, where does it end?
- I'm just concerned. Again, that's my 19 point of sort of the slippery slope. Because once youlput additional information and more, sort of grazular information in front of someone, you open it 20p for more discussion and more discussion.
- And, again, I'm sympathetic, but I just don25t know how we help you out here.

- 1 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. I'm going to stop beating the horse, because I think the horse may 3be dead. Although, I mean, we need to talk about this in the future because this is very important.
- I have been on the BZA when people have com@ and said that a project will be infeasible.
- There was a case that came to us for set down that we did not set down because the whole case turned on economic infeasibility and we said well what are you paying for the site, and they told us. And 2 we said well pay less. You know, that's what you3do. You don't go, oh I have it under contract for 4a certain amount of money and that amount of money is contingent -- I can only afford to pay it if 1 you give me my zoning relief. I mean, come on.
- COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: But, I mean, just 17 to 18ay pay less. I mean, that's a rather -- I mean, given market conditions and so forth. I mean, we definitely want the city to be developed and we're locking for more housing, more economic -- I mean --
 - 22 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: But guess --
- COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: -- I don't think 23 we 2dan just simply say just pay less.
 - 25 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: But guess what

happened in that case? They turned around, renegotiated their price and they're building a matter of right project.

- COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Oh, so the Zoning Commission is going to be in the position to start to have the developers go back and renegotiate their cas∉s?
 - CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: This is --
- COMMISSIONER PARSONS: We have done that before.
- CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: This is a core issue 11 bedause people should not presume when they buy a piace of property that they will be granted relief and4then come and say because I paid so much anticipating that you would give me relief, if you don6t give it to me, then I have an economic handship.
 - COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: No. 18
- 19 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: We're straying, folks.
 - CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: We are. Okay. 21
- 22 Mr. Parsons, I've asked you for something. You can either accept it or deny it. And 4at this point --
 - COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I can't accept

your amendment.

- 2 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. Then I withdraw my amendment.
- 4 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I don't have a second on my motion, so --
 - 6 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You do.
 - 7 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: I'll second.
 - 8 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Okay. Thank you.
 - 9 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
- 10 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: I'll second it again.
- Defigre you call for the vote. I just want to make sume. It seems like I only did the sua sponte as Mr15Parsons said to a certain point on the security isame. But, again, we definitely, and we're taking in 1% response from somebody after everything was closed. I just want to make sure we understand that when the ANC group and the neighborhood group come down and do the same thing that we take the same consideration.

 MR. BERGSTEIN: I'd like to classify the scope of the motion.
- It's my understanding that Mr. Parson's motion is not to reopen the record and not to take anything in addition to the record, unless they want

- to.1 But for the BZA to look at the record before them and to address security concerns that Mr. Parsons just articulated by fashioning some additional conditions. COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Exactly.
- MR. BERGSTEIN: So, at this juncture, there will be no additional submittals into the record by anybody, unless the Board decides to reopen the record for that purpose.
 - COMMISSIONER PARSONS: That's my intent. 10
- VICE CHAIRMAN HOOD: Right. That's the 11 But, Mr. Bergstein, did or did not Secret Senvice or somebody try to get something in and was noti4able to?
- 15 MR. BERGSTEIN: No. In fact, I'm not awase at this point that anyone has tried. There's bean no formal motion --
- VICE CHAIRMAN HOOD: Well, maybe it's the 18 Sengeant in Arms. Somebody.
- COMMISSIONER PARSONS: The Architect of 20 th@1Capitol, and that's my concern. He didn't respond to it.
 - 23 VICE CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay.
- MR. BERGSTEIN: At this juncture, I don't beliseve that either the Capitol Police Board -- the

Capitol Police Board at this point, I believe, has requested party status in this proceeding which is probably going to be mute. But, at this juncture, it's my understanding that the Capitol Police Board, the 5 Architect of the Capitol, neither of them has of yet although they still may, request the BZA to reopen the record for permission to accept addational things. But at this juncture it's my understand that that has not been requested. And thate's nothing that you're doing or may do tonight that will compel that to occur.

- If the motion is made to the BZA, they 12 have the complete discretion whether or not to grant that motion. But that motion has not been made and the 5BZA has not yet ruled upon it.
- 16 VICE CHAIRMAN HOOD: Okay. So, it's nothing contingent. It's nothing floating out there fon8them to open the record and --
 - 19 MR. BERGSTEIN:
 - VICE CHAIRMAN HOOD: -- making a --20
 - MR. BERGSTEIN: Not at this juncture. 21
- 22 VICE CHAIRMAN HOOD: But still, I still want us to reconsider when neighborhoods come down and 4do the same thing.
 - Okay. Thank you.

- 1 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Just so that you don2t think I'm being spiteful.
- I just want you to know that I will not be supporting your motion, but it's because --
 - 5 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I'm not surprised.
- CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: But it's because I've never felt that the security issues were the compelling reason and I don't want to -- I don't want to -- for me, I don't want to cheapen the sua spante by sort of throwing a bone to the Architect of 1the Capitol for reasons that I don't think rose to 12he level of granting the sua sponte in the first place.
- So, I just wanted to put that on the 14 redord.
 - 16 So, is there any further discussion?
 - All those in favor, please say aye. 17
 - (AYES) 18
- 19 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Those opposed, please say no. No.
 - Any abstentions? 21
- 22 VICE CHAIRMAN HOOD: I'm going to abstain.
- CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Mrs. 24 Schellin, let's record that vote for what it's

worth.

- 2 MRS. SCHELLIN: Staff would record the vote --
- 4 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Would you turn on your microphone?
- 6 MRS. SCHELLIN: I'm sorry. The staff would record the vote two to one to two to not remaind the case back to the BZA based on Mr. Parsons' motion.
- Again, Mr. Parsons moving, Commissioner

 Jefffries seconding, Commissioner Mitten against,

 Commissioner Hildebrand not present, not voting and

 Commissioner Hood abstaining.
 - 14 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.
- Now, Mr. Bergstein, where does that leave us 16
- 17 MR. BERGSTEIN: The motion to remand fails.
 - 19 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And that's the end?
 - MR. BERGSTEIN: That would be the end.
 - 21 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
- MR. BERGSTEIN: Unless you care to -- no, it 20ould stand.
 - 24 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Want to again?
 - 25 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Should I.

www.nealrgross.com

- 1 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: No.
- 2 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. We're done.
- 3 Thank you.
- 4 Okay. The Special Public Meeting is now adjourned.
 - 6 Do you need a break?
 - 7 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Go ahead.
- 8 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right. This is good evening. Thank you for bearing with us and hope you found that discussion somewhat interesting.
- 11 (Whereupon, the Special Public Meeting was2adjourned at 6:46 p.m.)